



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/035,607	12/28/2001	Peter F. Corbett	112056-0031	3778

24267 7590 02/07/2005

CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP
88 BLACK FALCON AVENUE
BOSTON, MA 02210

EXAMINER

KERVEROS, JAMES C

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2133

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/035,607

Applicant(s)

CORBETT ET AL.

Examiner

JAMES C KERVEROS

Art Unit

2133

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 November 2004.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-87 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 86 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-85 and 87 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is a Final Office Action in response to AMENDMENT filed November 18, 2004, in reply to the Office Action mailed September 7, 2004.

Claims 1-87 are pending. Claims 1-41 are original. Claims 42-87 are new.

Claim 86 is withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention, as indicated by the Election/Restrictions requirements, below.

Claims 1-85 and 87 are presently under examination.

Election/Restrictions

2. Newly submitted claim 86 is directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons:

Claim 86 (INVENTION I) is drawn to Electromagnetic signals propagating on a computer network, for carrying instructions for execution on a processor for the practice of a method for correcting failures in a storage array. Claims 1-85 and 87 (INVENTION II) are drawn to a system and method for correcting failures in a storage array using a combination of a single diagonal parity group and multiple row parity groups, organizing the storage array as a plurality of concatenated sub-arrays.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I (claim 86) and II (claims 1-85 and 87) are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention I (claim 86) has as separate utility such as electromagnetic

signals propagating on a computer network, which can be separately used to carry signals in a typical wireless link of a communication system, and which does not require correcting failures in a storage array of Invention II. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claim 86 is withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-85 and 87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Han et al. (US 6158017).

Regarding independent Claim 1, Han discloses a method and apparatus for storing parity and rebuilding the data contents of two failed disks in a storage array, comprising the steps of: Providing the storage array, which is defined as a matrix (DH2), with a number of storage devices $N+1$ disks (d_0 - d_7) each logically divided into $N-1$ data blocks, where N is a prime number, shown in (FIGS. 2, 4 and 8 to 10). The

Art Unit: 2133

predetermined number of storage devices n is $p+1$, wherein $n=p+1$ and p is a prime number. FIG. 4 shows a disk array including six disks ($N+1=6$) d_0 to d_5 , where p is a prime number N . If $N=5$, then ($5+1=6$), which is the predetermined number of storage devices " n ".

Including a plurality of first devices configured to store data and row parity, and diagonal parity device configured to store diagonal parity, such as data blocks of a row being defined as a horizontal parity group and upwardly continuous diagonal line being defined as a diagonal parity group. Defining the data blocks of the last disk as the horizontal parity blocks. Defining the data blocks existing in the $(N-1)$ row of the matrix as the diagonal parity blocks. Analyzing a diagonal parity group including one of error data blocks of the two failed disks to restore the one error data block, and the horizontal parity group including the restored one error data block to restore another error data block, where the analyzing step is repeated to completely rebuilt the data contents of the two failed disks (Abstract and Summary of the Invention).

A plurality of first devices [d_0 to d_5] configured to store data and row parity, FIG. 4, which shows a disk array including six disks ($N+1=6$) d_0 to d_5 , each of which is logically divided into four blocks ($N-1=4$), where (30) represents the horizontal parity group including the second block b_1 . The hatched blocks of the sixth disk d_5 represent the horizontal parity blocks. FIG. 8 shows the horizontal parity group Nos. 0, 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the DH2 parity arrangement in the case of $N=7$, where the hatched blocks H_0 to H_4 represent the horizontal parity blocks of the horizontal parity groups.

One diagonal parity device configured to store diagonal parity, defined in the Definition 3 and shown in FIG. 4. The blocks enclosed in the slotted line (32) represent the second parity group. In addition, the blocks of the fourth row ($i=3$) marked with dots represent the diagonal parity blocks to respectively store the parity values of the diagonal parity groups. FIG. 9 illustrates the diagonal parity groups $N=7$, where the blocks D0 to D6 marked with dots represent the diagonal parity blocks.

Regarding independent Claims 7, 18, 24, 30, 36, 41, 42, 64, 87, in addition to the common limitations as applied to claim 1, above, Han discloses a processing element controller 4 (see FIG. 2) configured to execute the storage operating system to thereby invoke storage access operations to and from the array in accordance with the R-D parity technique. "The parity storage algorithm of the DH2 parity arrangement provides a method for obtaining the parity values of the data blocks of the parity groups by XOR'ing, as shown in FIG. 15. A disk array of $(N+1)$ is controlled by the controller 4 (see FIG. 2) to store the horizontal and diagonal parities respectively through steps 210 and 220".

Regarding independent Claims 1, 7, 18, 24, 30, 36, 41, 42, 64, 87, Han does not disclose the feature of "one diagonal parity device configured to store diagonal parity". In FIG. 10, Han depicts the parities and data in the form of a matrix of $N=7$ of the DH2 parity arrangement, where H0 to H4 represent the horizontal parity blocks of the horizontal parity group Nos. 0 to 5, stored in the horizontal parity device $N=7$, while D0 to D6 represent the diagonal parity blocks of the diagonal parity group Nos. 0 to 6, stored in devices (d0-d6) disks. It would have been obvious to a person having

Art Unit: 2133

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to rearrange the matrix of Han by incorporating an additional dedicated disk for storing the diagonal parity group, since the matrix is expandable according to $N+1$ disks, where if $N=7$, then the number of disks is $N+1=8$. A person skilled in the art would have recognized that by adding a dedicated disk, for storing diagonal parity, it provides redundancy and thus enhances system reliability.

Regarding Claims 2, 8, 19, 25, 31, Han discloses row parity blocks (H0 to H4) representing the horizontal parity blocks of the horizontal parity group Nos. (0 to 5), stored in the horizontal parity device $N=7$, FIG. 10.

Regarding Claims 3, 17, 23, 29, 33, 39, Han discloses first devices (d0-d6) including a plurality of data Devices (d0-d6), wherein the absent data devices are treated as containing zero-valued data, since they are not in the system.

Regarding Claims 4, 9, 20, 26, Han discloses computation of row parity blocks, which is replaced by a redundant encoding of data blocks. In FIG. 15, Han discloses a disk array, which is controlled by the controller 4 (see FIG. 2) to store the horizontal and diagonal parities respectively through steps 210 and 220. In step 210, the controller 4 calculates upon the horizontal parities of the horizontal parity group Nos. 0 to $(N-3)$ to encode the horizontal parity blocks with the corresponding horizontal parities.

Regarding Claims 5, 13, 34, 43-63, 65-85, Han discloses a disk array (Structure of DH2 Parity Arrangement), which consists of $N+1$ disks where N =prime number, and each of the disks is logically divided into $N-1$ blocks, then a matrix is defined as an $(N-$

1)*(N+1) matrix, table 3, where the total length of the devices is unequal, and wherein each row has one row parity block and one diagonal parity block, FIG. 4.

Regarding Claim 6, Han discloses a device, wherein locations of parity blocks shift from device to device within different stripes, FIG. 10.

Regarding Claims 15, 35, Han discloses, FIGS. 2 and 4, a device, wherein each sub-array (DISK) is organized as a distributed parity disk array (FIGS. 4 and 8 to 10).

Regarding Claims 10-12, 14, Han describes a storage operating system including a device storage layer configured as a RAID layer storage devices, wherein the storage devices are disks, such as "6 levels of disk arrays from 0 level to 5 level, classified according to structure and characteristics of the disk array. RAID is composed of a plurality of disks that provide large capacity, make it possible to parallel process to secure high performance, and employ the redundancy to rebuild the data contents of failed disks" cited in Patterson et al, "A Case for Redundant Arrays of Inexpensive Disks (RAID)", Chicago ACM SIGMOD Conf. Report, pp. 109-116, published in 1988, (Col. 1, lines 24-33, Han).

Furthermore, Han describes, "The parity arrangements of RAID level 6 have two group sizes because a data block requires two parity blocks. For example, 2D has horizontal and vertical parities, and EO, DH and DH2 have error correction groups of horizontal and diagonal parities. Representing group size G of the various parity arrangements, the names of the parity arrangements are indicated as a superscript of G, and the parity groups as a subscript of G. G without a subscript means take the average of two group sizes" (Table 8, Col. 18, lines 60-67, Han).

Regarding Claim 16, Han discloses devices, which are media adapted to store information contained within the data and parity blocks, as shown in FIG. 4, which illustrates diagonal and horizontal parity groups together with parity blocks according to the DH2 of FIG. 2.

Regarding Claims 21, 22, 27, 28, 37, 38, Han discloses means for dividing each device into blocks, means for organizing the blocks into stripes, and means for storing diagonal parity blocks on the diagonal parity disk for each of the diagonal parity sets of a stripe except one, such as "exclusive OR'ing (XORing) the contents of each of the horizontal and diagonal parity groups to obtain the parity value stored into the parity block of the corresponding horizontal or diagonal parity group", see Summary of the Invention. FIGS. 15, 16-18 illustrate a process of storing the parities according to the inventive DH2 arrangement with the number of disks $N=7$.

Regarding Claim 40, Han discloses predetermined number of storage devices n , wherein $n=p+1$ and p is a prime number. FIG. 4 shows a disk array including six disks ($N+1=6$) d_0 to d_5 , where N is a prime number. If $N=5$, then $n=(5+1=6)$, where " n " is the predetermined number of storage devices.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed November 18, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Claims 1-85 and 87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Han et al. (US 6158017), as set forth in the present Office Action.

Applicant urges, on page 28 of the Amendment, that Han is silent concerning Applicant's claimed invention of ***“providing the array with a predetermined number of storage devices, including a plurality of first devices configured to store data and row parity, and one diagonal parity device configured to store diagonal parity,..... computing and storing the diagonal parity for all of the diagonal parity sets except one on the diagonal parity device.*”**

In summarizing the claimed limitation, as argued by the Applicant in his remarks, clearly Han discloses a system (Figures 2, 4, 8-10) illustrating the structure of a disk array according to a DH2 (diagonal and horizontal) parity arrangement to correct multiple storage device failures in a storage array using a combination of multiple first parity groups such as Figure 9 illustrates “the diagonal parity groups with identification numbers in the case of N=7, where the blocks D0 to D6 marked with dots represent the diagonal parity blocks”, and a single secondary parity group, such as Figure 10 depicting the “arrangement of the parities and data in the form of a matrix in the case of N=7 in the DH2 parity arrangement. Reference numerals H0 to H4 represent the horizontal parity blocks of the horizontal parity group Nos. 0 to 5, and D0 to D6 represent the diagonal parity blocks of the diagonal parity group Nos. “0 to 6”, the system comprising:

A storage array (Figures 8-10) having a plurality of concatenated sub-arrays (d0-d6), each sub-array (d0-d6) including a set of data storage devices such as “the data blocks is identified by i and j, where i represents the horizontal parity groups and j the diagonal parity groups”, and a first parity storage device corresponding to (D0-D6)

Art Unit: 2133

representing the diagonal parity blocks of the diagonal parity group Nos. "0 to 6"; the array further including a global secondary storage device (H0 to H4) represent the horizontal parity blocks of the horizontal parity group Nos. 0 to 5 and holding secondary parity values (horizontal parity blocks) for the single secondary parity group, the secondary parity values computed across the concatenation of the sub-arrays.

In response to applicant's argument that Han teaches away from Applicant's claimed novel invention by showing two ways to store diagonal parity, both of which spread the diagonal parity out as blocks on all of the disks, the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

In response to applicant's argument that the advantages, described in the specification, page 9 lines 3-14, of Applicant's claimed invention, would be lost on a person of ordinary skill in the art of computer disk storage of data as disclosed by Han, and therefore there is no suggestion to modify Han, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Han discloses a plurality of first devices configured to store

Art Unit: 2133

data and row parity, and diagonal parity device configured to store diagonal parity, such as data blocks of a row being defined as a horizontal parity group and upwardly continuous diagonal line being defined as a diagonal parity group, as described in the Office Action above.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **JAMES C KERVEROS** whose telephone number is (571) 272-3824. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM TO 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on (571) 272-3819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Examiner's Fax: (703) 746-4461
Email: james.kerveros@uspto.gov

Date: 25 January 2005
Office Action: Final Rejection

By: 

JAMES C KERVEROS
Examiner
Art Unit 2133


Primary Examiner